arXiv:1203.1280v1 [math.AP] 6 Mar 2012

HYPERCONTRACTIVITY AND ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOUR IN NONAUTONOMOUS KOLMOGOROV EQUATIONS

L. ANGIULI, L. LORENZI AND A. LUNARDI

Abstract. We consider a class of nonautonomous second order parabolic equations with unbounded coefficients defined in $I \times \mathbb{R}^d$, where I is a right-halfline. We prove logarithmic Sobolev and Poincaré inequalities with respect to an associated evolution system of measures $\{\mu_t : t \in I\}$, and we deduce hypercontractivity and asymptotic behaviour results for the evolution operator $G(t,s)$.

1. Introduction

We consider nonautonomous Cauchy problems,

$$\begin{cases} D_t u(t,x) = \mathcal{A}(t)u(t,x), & (t,x) \in (s,+\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ u(s,x) = f(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\{\mathcal{A}(t)\}_{t\in I}$ is a family of second order differential operators,

$$(\mathcal{A}(t)\zeta)(x) = \mathrm{Tr}(Q(t)D^2\zeta(x)) + \langle b(t,x), \nabla\zeta(x)\rangle, \tag{1.2}$$

with smooth enough coefficients $Q = [q_{ij}]_{i,j=1,\dots,d}$ and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_d)$, defined in I and $I \times \mathbb{R}^d$, respectively, where I is an open right halfline and $s \in I$. Throughout the paper we assume that the coefficients q_{ij} are bounded and that the operators $\mathcal{A}(t)$ are uniformly elliptic, i.e., there exists a positive constant η_0 such that

$$\langle Q(t)\xi, \xi\rangle \geq \eta_0|\xi|^2, \qquad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d, \ t \in I. \tag{1.3}$$

Problem (1.1) arises (after time reversal) as a Kolmogorov equation of the stochastic differential equation

$$dX(t,s,x) = b(t, X(t,s,x))dt + \sigma(t)dW_t, \quad X(s,s,x) = x,$$

where W_t is a standard d-dimensional Brownian motion, and $Q(t) = \sigma(t)(\sigma(t))^*/2$. There is no need that b be bounded to have existence in the large of a strong solution for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and to define the transition evolution operator $f \mapsto \mathbb{E}(f(X(t,s,x)))$ that leads to (1.1), see e.g., [2, 10].

It is well known that the usual L^p spaces with respect to the Lebesgue measure dx are not a natural setting for elliptic and parabolic operators with unbounded coefficients, unless quite strong growth assumptions are imposed on their coefficients. For instance, if $\varepsilon > 0$ no realization of the operator $(\mathcal{A}\zeta)(x) = \zeta''(x) \pm \mathrm{sign}(x)|x|^{1+\varepsilon}\zeta'(x)$ in $L^p(\mathbb{R}, dx)$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup, as it has been shown in [19]. Much better settings are L^p spaces with respect to the so called evolution systems of measures $\{\mu_t : t \in I\}$. An evolution system of measures $\{\mu_t : t \in I\}$ for

---

Date: February 25, 2013.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35K10, 35K15, 35B40.

Key words and phrases. nonautonomous second order elliptic operators, unbounded coefficients, evolution operators, logarithmic Sobolev inequality, hypercontractivity, asymptotic behavior.

a Markov evolution operator $G(t,s)$ is a family of Borel probability measures in $\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t,s)f\mu_t(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu_s(dx), \qquad t>s\in I,\ \ f\in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{1.4}$$

As noticed e.g., in [3], the family $\{\mu_t : t\in I\}$ is the natural nonautonomous counterpart of the invariant measure for a Markov semigroup in the autonomous case. If an evolution system of measures exists, formula (1.4) allows easily to prove that for $p\ge 1$ we have

$$\|G(t,s)f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)} \le \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}, \qquad t\ge s,\ \ f\in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d), \tag{1.5}$$

and consequently $G(t,s)$ may be extended to a contraction (still denoted by $G(t,s)$) from $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ into $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$ for any $t>s$. However, in general the spaces $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ and $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$ are different if $t\neq s$, and the classical theory of evolution operators in fixed Banach spaces cannot be used.

Under mild assumptions on Q and b, in [12] the existence of a Markov evolution operator $G(t,s)$ associated to the family $\{\mathcal{A}(t)\}_{t\in I}$, as well as the existence of a tight evolution system of measures $\{\mu_t :\ t\in I\}$, have been proved. In this paper we study the asymptotic behavior of $G(t,s)$ as $t\to+\infty$, and we prove hypercontractivity results in the spaces $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$.

In addition to the basic hypotheses of [12], we assume that the quadratic form associated to the Jacobian matrix $\nabla_x b$ is uniformly negative definite, namely there exists $r_0<0$ such that

$$\langle \nabla_x b(t,x)\xi,\xi\rangle \le r_0|\xi|^2, \qquad t\in I,\ \ x,\xi\in\mathbb{R}^d.$$

This is a strong assumption that yields strong qualitative results, such as the pointwise gradient estimate

$$|(\nabla_x G(t,s)f)(x)| \le e^{r_0(t-s)}(G(t,s)|\nabla f|)(x), \tag{1.6}$$

valid for every $f\in C^1_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $t\ge s$, $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$, and its consequence

$$\|\,|\nabla_x G(t,s)f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)} \le c_p e^{r_0(t-s)}\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}, \qquad t\ge s+1,\ \ f\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s), \tag{1.7}$$

see [12]. The starting point of our analysis is the proof of the logarithmic Sobolev inequality (in short LSI) for the measures μ_t, in the form

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^p\log|f|\,\mu_t(dx) \le &\frac{1}{p}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|f|^p\mu_t(dx)\right)\log\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|f|^p\mu_t(dx)\right)\\ &+pC\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|f|^{p-2}|\nabla f|^2\chi_{\{f\neq 0\}}\mu_t(dx),\end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

for any $t\in I$, any $p\in(1,+\infty)$ and some positive constant C, independent of $f\in C^1_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, t and p. The gradient estimate (1.6) allows us to follow the method used by Deuschel and Stroock [6] in the autonomous case for the invariant measure μ of a Markov semigroup, but the proof is much more complicated because the measures μ_t depend explicitly on time. In particular, we have to deal with the regularity of μ_t with respect to t. We use in a crucial way a differentiability property,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x)\mu_t(dx) = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\mathcal{A}(t)f)(x)\mu_t(dx), \qquad t\in I, \tag{1.9}$$

valid for every $f\in C^2_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, constant outside a compact set.

Under Hypotheses 2.1, the operator $G(t,s)$ is bounded from $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ into $W^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$ for $I\ni s<t$, $q\in(1,+\infty)$ ([12]). The question whether it is bounded (or, even better, contractive) from $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ into $L^r(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$ for some $r>q$, is particularly meaningful. Indeed, Sobolev embedding theorems do not hold in general, as the simple example of the standard Gaussian measure in $\mathbb{R}$ shows, hence it is not obvious that $G(t,s)$ improves summability.

We prove that in fact this is the case. We follow the method of [9] that deals with time depending Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operators,

$$(\mathcal{A}(t)\zeta)(x)=\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}(Q(t)(Q(t))^*D^2\zeta(x))+\langle B(t)x+f(t),\nabla\zeta(x)\rangle,\qquad t\in\mathbb{R},\ x\in\mathbb{R}^d,\tag{1.10}$$

and that is, in its turn, an extension of the method of Gross ([11]) to a nonautonomous setting, where the LSI (1.8) plays a fundamental role. However, in [9] there are an explicit representation formula for the evolution operator and explicit representation formulae for the measures μ_t, that are used in the proof of the LSI and of the hypercontractivity. On the contrary, in our case $G(t,s)$ and μ_t are not explicit.

Another important consequence of (1.8) is the Poincaré inequality

$$\|f-m_s(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}\le C_p\|\,|\nabla f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)},\qquad f\in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s),\ s\in I,\tag{1.11}$$

where $m_s(f)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}fd\mu_s$, and C_p is a positive constant, independent of f and s. First (1.11) is proved for $p=2$, then, by a bootstrap argument, we extend it to $p>2$.

Using the Poincaré inequality with $p=2$ and the hypercontractivity of $G(t,s)$, we compare the asymptotic behavior (as $t\to+\infty$) of $\|G(t,s)f-m_sf\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}$ and $\|\,|\nabla_xG(t,s)f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}$. Precisely, we prove the equality $\mathfrak{A}_p=\mathfrak{B}_p$, for any $p\in(1,+\infty)$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{A}_p=&\big\{\omega\in\mathbb{R}:\exists M_{p,\omega}>0\text{ s.t. }\|G(t,s)f-m_s(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\le M_{p,\omega}e^{\omega(t-s)}\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)},\\&\quad I\ni s<t,\ f\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)\big\};\\ \mathfrak{B}_p=&\big\{\omega\in\mathbb{R}:\exists N_{p,\omega}>0\text{ s.t. }\|\,|\nabla_xG(t,s)f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\le N_{p,\omega}e^{\omega(t-s)}\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)},\\&\quad s,t\in I,\ t-s\ge1,\ f\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

We also show that $\mathfrak{A}_p$ is independent of p. Then, estimate (1.7) implies that $r_0\in\mathfrak{B}_p$, and therefore $\|G(t,s)-m_s\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s),L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t))}$ decays exponentially to zero, as $t\to+\infty$.

In the case of the nonautonomous Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operators (1.10) we prove the conjecture in [9] on the optimal decay estimate of $\|G(t,s)f-m_s(f)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}$ as $t\to+\infty$ and we show that the same optimal decay estimate holds also replacing $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$ by $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$ for any $p>1$. See Subsection 7.1.

The equality $\mathfrak{A}_p=\mathfrak{B}_p$ was already proved in [14] in the case that the coefficients q_{ij}, b_i are periodic with respect to t, under more restrictive assumptions and only for $p\ge2$.

Since most of our asymptotic behaviour results are expressed in terms of the measures μ_t, the asymptotic behaviour of μ_t as $t\to+\infty$ is also of interest. The explicit determination of all the weak* limit measures of μ_t as $t\to+\infty$ is out of hope in general. Here, we consider the case where the coefficients q_{ij} and b_j $(i,j=1,\dots,d)$ converge as $t\to+\infty$, and we prove that μ_t weakly* converges to the invariant measure μ of the semigroup generated by the limiting operator.

Differently from [9] and [14] all the results of this paper are proved without using the evolution semigroup associated to the evolution family $G(t,s)$.

Our results heavily rely on the LSI (1.8) which is proved using the pointwise gradient estimate (1.6). Even in the autonomous case (1.6) does not hold when the diffusion coefficients depend on x and they do not satisfy the condition in [21]. This is the reason why we consider diffusion coefficients depending only on t.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce our hypotheses and we collect some preliminary results. Section 3 is devoted to establish the logarithmic Sobolev inequality and, as a consequence, the compactness of the embedding $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)\hookrightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$, for any $p\geq 2$ and any $s\in I$, and the compactness of the operator $G(t,s)$ from $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ into $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$ for any $t>s$ and any $p\in(1,+\infty)$. Next, in Section 4 we prove the hypercontractivity of $G(t,s)$. In Section 5 we establish the Poincaré inequality for every $p\geq 2$, we prove the exponential convergence of $G(t,s)$ to m_s in $\mathcal{L}(L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s),L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t))$ and we characterize it in terms of the convergence rate to zero of $\nabla_x G(t,s)$. In Section 6 we study the asymptotic behaviour of μ_t when the coefficients converge as $t\to+\infty$. Finally, in Section 7 we briefly comment on our hypotheses and give examples of nonautonomous operators to which the results of this paper may be applied.

Notations. Let Ω be an open set or the closure of an open set in $\mathbb{R}^N$, and let $k\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{+\infty\}$. We consider the usual spaces $C(\Omega)$ and $C^k(\Omega)$, as well as $C^k_b(\Omega)$, the subspace of $C^k(\Omega)$ consisting of bounded functions with bounded derivatives up to the k-th order. For $\alpha\in(0,1)$, $C^\alpha(\Omega)$ is the usual Hölder space; we use the subscript "loc" to denote the space of all $f\in C(\Omega)$ which are α-Hölder continuous in any compact subset of Ω. We use the subscript "c" (resp. "0") instead of "b" for the subsets of the above spaces consisting of functions with compact support (resp. vanishing at infinity).

If $J\subset\mathbb{R}$ is an interval, the parabolic Hölder spaces $C^{\alpha/2,\alpha}(J\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ ($\alpha\in(0,1)$) and $C^{1,2}(J\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ are defined in the usual way; the subscript "loc" has the same meaning as above.

About partial derivatives, the notations $D_tf:=\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}$, $D_if:=\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}$, $D_{ij}f:=\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}$ are extensively used.

About matrices and vectors, we denote by $\det(Q)$, $\mathrm{Tr}(Q)$ and $\langle x,y\rangle$ the determinant, the trace of the square matrix Q and the scalar product of the vectors $x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d$, respectively. The adjoint of Q is denoted by Q^*.

By χ_A and $\mathbb{1}$ we denote, respectively, the characteristic function of the set $A\subset\mathbb{R}^d$ and the function which is identically equal to 1 in $\mathbb{R}^d$. The ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$ centered at 0 with radius $r>0$ is denoted by $B(0,r)$. The Lebesgue measure in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by dx.

2. Assumptions and preliminary results

Let I be an open right halfline. For $t\in I$ we consider linear second order differential operators $\mathcal{A}(t)$ defined on smooth functions ζ by

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{A}(t)\zeta)(x)&=\sum_{i,j=1}^d q_{ij}(t)D_{ij}\zeta(x)+\sum_{i=1}^d b_i(t,x)D_i\zeta(x)\\&=\mathrm{Tr}(Q(t)D^2\zeta(x))+\langle b(t,x),\nabla\zeta(x)\rangle,\qquad x\in\mathbb{R}^d,\end{aligned}$$

under the following assumptions on their coefficients.

Hypotheses 2.1. (i) *$q_{ij}\in C^{\alpha/2}_{\mathrm{loc}}(I)$ and $b_i\in C^{\alpha/2,\alpha}_{\mathrm{loc}}(I\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ $(i,j=1,\dots,d)$ for some $\alpha\in(0,1)$;*

(ii) *for every $t\in I$, the matrix $Q(t)=[q_{ij}(t)]_{i,j=1,\dots,d}$ is symmetric and there exist $0<\eta_0<\Lambda$ such that*

$$\eta_0|\xi|^2\leq\langle Q(t)\xi,\xi\rangle\leq\Lambda|\xi|^2,\qquad(t,\xi)\in I\times\mathbb{R}^d;\tag{2.1}$$

(iii) *there exists $\varphi\in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with positive values such that*

$$\lim_{|x|\to+\infty}\varphi(x)=+\infty\quad\text{and}\quad(\mathcal{A}(t)\varphi)(x)\leq a-c\,\varphi(x),\quad(t,x)\in I\times\mathbb{R}^d\tag{2.2}$$

for some positive constants a and c;

(iv) *the first order spatial derivatives of b_i exist, belong to $C^{\alpha/2,\alpha}_{\rm loc}(I\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ for any $i=1,\dots,d$, and there exists $r_0<0$ such that*

$$\langle \nabla_x b(t,x)\xi,\xi\rangle \le r_0|\xi|^2, \qquad (t,x)\in I\times\mathbb{R}^d,\ \ \xi\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.3}$$

Throughout the paper we assume that all the conditions in Hypotheses 2.1 are satisfied, if not otherwise specified. Let us make some comments.

Remark 2.2. As easily seen, condition (2.3) is equivalent to

$$\langle b(t,x)-b(t,y),x-y\rangle \le r_0|x-y|^2, \qquad t\in I,\ \ x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.4}$$

Then:

(a) taking $y=0$ we get $\langle b(t,x),x\rangle \le \langle b(t,0),x\rangle + r_0|x|^2$, and since $r_0<0$, for any $[a,b]\subset I$ there exists a positive constant $C_{a,b}$ such that

$$\langle b(t,x),x\rangle \le C_{a,b}, \qquad t\in[a,b],\ \ x\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.5}$$

This estimate will be used later, in the proof of the LSI inequality and of the hypercontractivity.

(b) If $b(\cdot,\overline{y})$ is bounded in I for some $\overline{y}\in\mathbb{R}^d$, the function $\varphi(x):=e^{\delta|x-\overline{y}|^2}$ satisfies Hypothesis 2.1(iii) if $\delta>0$ is small enough. Similarly, if $\langle b(t,x),x\rangle \le -C|x|^\beta$ for $|x|$ large, with $C>0$, $\beta>1$ independent of t and x, then the function $\varphi(x):=e^{\delta|x|^\beta}$ satisfies Hypothesis 2.1(iii) if $\delta>0$ is small enough. See Section 7 for more details.

Under Hypotheses 2.1(i)-(iii), in [12] a Markov evolution operator $G(t,s)$ associated to (1.1) has been constructed. Here we recall its main properties.

For every continuous and bounded function $f:\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}$ and for any $s\in I$, the function $(t,x)\mapsto (G(t,s)f)(x)$ is the unique bounded classical solution to the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} D_t u(t,x)=\mathcal{A}(t)u(t,x), & t>s, \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^d,\\ u(s,x)=f(x), & \qquad\quad\ x\in\mathbb{R}^d.\end{cases}$$

Then, $G(\cdot,s)f\in C_b([s,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d)\cap C^{1,2}((s,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover,

$$(G(t,s)f)(x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(t,s,x,y)f(y)dy, \qquad s<t,\ \ x\in\mathbb{R}^d, \tag{2.6}$$

where $g:\{(t,s)\in I\times I: t>s\}\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}$ is a positive function such that $\|g(t,s,x,\cdot)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}=1$ for any $t,s\in I$, with $t>s$, and any $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$ ([12, Prop. 2.4]).

By [12, Thm. 5.4] there exists an evolution system of measures $\{\mu_t: t\in I\}$ for $G(t,s)$. The Lyapunov function φ is in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$ for every $t\in I$, and there exists a constant $M>0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\varphi(y)\mu_t(dy)\le M, \qquad t\in I. \tag{2.7}$$

This implies that the family of measures $\{\mu_t: t\in I\}$ is *tight*, that is for every $\varepsilon>0$ there exists $R=R_\varepsilon>0$ such that $\mu_t(\mathbb{R}^d\setminus B(0,R))\le\varepsilon$ for any $t\in I$.

Moreover, (2.6) implies $|(G(t,s)f)(x)|^p\le (G(t,s)|f|^p)(x)$ for every $f\in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $t>s\in I$, $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$ and $p\ge 1$. Integrating with respect to μ_t and using (1.4) we obtain

$$\|G(t,s)f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\le\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}, \qquad t>s\in I, \tag{2.8}$$

and since $C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$, $G(t,s)$ may be extended to a contraction (still denoted by $G(t,s)$) from $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$, such that (1.4) holds for every $f\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$.

If also Hypothesis 2.1(iv) holds, then $\{\mu_t : t \in I\}$ is the *unique* tight evolution system of measures. See next Remark 2.8. Moreover, in this case the following results have been proved in [12, Thm. 4.5] and [15, (proof of) Prop. 3.3].

Proposition 2.3. (i) *The pointwise gradient estimate*

$$|(\nabla_x G(t,s)f)(x)|^p \le e^{pr_0(t-s)}(G(t,s)|\nabla f|^p)(x), \tag{2.9}$$

holds for every $f \in C^1_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $t \ge s$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $p \in [1,+\infty)$.

(ii) *For each $p \in (1,+\infty)$ and $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$, the function $G(t,s)f$ belongs to $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$ and there exists a constant c_p, independent of f, such that*

$$\|\,|\nabla_x G(t,s)f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)} \le c_p(t-s)^{-1/2}\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}, \qquad s<t\le s+1. \tag{2.10}$$

Lemma 2.4. *Under Hypotheses 2.1(i)-(iii), for every $s \in I$ the measure μ_s is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. More precisely, $\mu_s = \rho(s,\cdot)dx$ for some strictly positive and locally Hölder continuous function $\rho : I \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. The measures μ_s are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure by [12, Prop. 5.2]. Local Hölder continuity and positivity of ρ is a consequence of [1, Sect. 3]. More precisely, by [1, Thm. 3.8] we know that the measure ν on $I \times \mathbb{R}^d$, defined on products of Borel sets $A \subset I$ and $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$\nu(A\times B) = \int_A \mu_s(B)ds,$$

has a positive density ρ with respect to the Lebesgue measure, and $\rho \in C^\gamma_{\rm loc}(I\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ for each $\gamma \in (0,1)$. Hence, for each Borel set $A \subset I$ and for $\zeta \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we have

$$\int_A ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \zeta\mu_s(dx) = \int_{I\times\mathbb{R}^d} \chi_A\zeta d\nu = \int_A ds\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\zeta\rho(s,\cdot)dx.$$

Since A is arbitrary,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \zeta(x)\mu_s(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\zeta(x)\rho(s,x)dx, \qquad \text{for a.e. } s\in I. \tag{2.11}$$

Let us prove that (2.11) in fact holds for every $s \in I$, showing that both sides are continuous with respect to s. The right hand side is continuous since ρ is. By (1.4) the left hand side is equal to $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(r,s)\zeta\mu_r(dx)$ for any $r > s$, and the function $s \mapsto G(r,s)\zeta$ is continuous in $I \cap (-\infty, r]$, by [12, Lemma 3.2]. Then, $s \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\zeta\mu_s(dx)$ is continuous in $I\cap(-\infty,r]$, and since r is arbitrary, it is continuous in I. Then, (2.11) holds for each $s \in I$.

Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be any Borel set. Then χ_B is the a.e. limit (with respect to the Lebesgue measure and, hence, with respect to each μ_s) of a bounded sequence of smooth and compactly supported functions. From (2.11) we infer

$$\int_B \mu_s(dx) = \int_B \rho(s,x)dx, \qquad s\in I, \tag{2.12}$$

and the proof is complete. □

The following lemma will be frequently used in the next sections. Its (easy) proof follows from a standard truncation argument and the equivalence of the Sobolev spaces $W^{1,p}(B(0,R),\rho dx)$ and $W^{1,p}(B(0,R),dx)$ for every $R > 0$, if ρ is a locally bounded function with positive infimum on every ball.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\mu(dx) = \rho(x)dx$ be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$, where $\rho : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is a locally bounded function with positive infimum on every ball. Then $C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)$.*

In particular, under Hypotheses 2.1(*i*)-(*iii*), $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *is dense in* $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ *for each* $s\in I$ *and* $p\in[1,+\infty)$.

As a first consequence, we obtain a decay estimate for the gradient of $G(t,s)f$ as $t\to+\infty$.

Proposition 2.6. *For every* $p\geq 1$ *there is* $K_p>0$ *such that for each* $s\in I$, $t\geq s+1$ *we have*

$$\|\,|\nabla_x G(t,s)f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\leq K_p e^{r_0(t-s)}\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)},\qquad f\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s).\tag{2.13}$$

Proof. Integrating (2.9) with respect to μ_t and using (1.4) we obtain

$$\|\,|\nabla_x G(t,s)f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\leq e^{r_0(t-s)}\|\,|\nabla f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)},\qquad t\geq s\in I,\tag{2.14}$$

for each $f\in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and hence for each $f\in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ by Lemma 2.5. If $t\geq s+1$ and $f\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$,

$$\|\,|\nabla_x G(t,s)f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}=\|\,|\nabla_x G(t,s+1)G(s+1,s)f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)},$$

and the statement follows from (2.14) and (2.10). ☐

For every $t\in I$ and $f\in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$ we denote by $m_t(f)$ the average of f with respect to μ_t, i.e.,

$$m_t(f)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}f(x)\mu_t(dx).\tag{2.15}$$

In the following lemma we prove that $G(t,s)f$ converges to $m_s(f)$ as $t\to+\infty$. It is a first step towards better asymptotic behavior results, and will be used in the proof of the LSI inequality. The same result has been proved in [14] in the case of time periodic coefficients; here estimate (2.9) allows us to give a much simpler proof.

Lemma 2.7. *For every* $s\in I$ *and* $p\in[1,+\infty)$ *we have*

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\|G(t,s)f-m_s(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}=0,\qquad f\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s).$$

Proof. Let $f\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then

$$(G(t,s)f)(x)-m_s(f)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}((G(t,s)f)(x)-(G(t,s)f)(y))\mu_t(dy),\quad t\geq s,\ x\in\mathbb{R}^d.$$

Set $B_t:=B(0,e^{-r_0t/2})$, where r_0 is defined in Hypothesis 2.1(iv), and $A_t:=\mathbb{R}^d\backslash B_t$. For $t\geq s$ and $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}|(G(t,s)f)(x)-m_s(f)|\leq&\int_{A_t}|(G(t,s)f)(x)-(G(t,s)f)(y)|\mu_t(dy)\\&+\int_{B_t}|(G(t,s)f)(x)-(G(t,s)f)(y)|\mu_t(dy)\\\leq&2\|f\|_\infty\mu_t(A_t)+\|\,|\nabla_x G(t,s)f|\,\|_\infty\int_{B_t}|x-y|\mu_t(dy)\\\leq&2\|f\|_\infty\mu_t(A_t)+e^{r_0(t-s)}\|\,|\nabla f|\,\|_\infty\left(|x|+\int_{B_t}|y|\mu_t(dy)\right)\\\leq&2\|f\|_\infty\mu_t(A_t)+\|\,|\nabla f|\,\|_\infty\left(e^{r_0(t-s)}|x|+e^{-r_0s}e^{\frac{1}{2}r_0t}\right),\end{aligned}\tag{2.16}$$

where we have used (2.9). It follows that

$$\|G(t,s)f-m_s(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}^p\leq\int_{A_t}|(G(t,s)f)(x)-m_s(f)|^p\,\mu_t(dx)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\int_{B_t}|(G(t,s)f)(x)-m_s(f)|^p\,\mu_t(dx)\\
\le{}& 2^p\|f\|_\infty^p\mu_t(A_t)+2^{p-1}\Big(2\|f\|_\infty\mu_t(A_t)+\|\,|\nabla f|\,\|_\infty e^{-r_0s}e^{\frac{1}{2}r_0t}\Big)^p\\
&+2^{p-1}(e^{r_0(t-s)}\|\,|\nabla f|\,\|_\infty)^p\int_{B_t}|x|^p\mu_t(dx)\\
\le{}& 2^p\|f\|_\infty^p\mu_t(A_t)\Big(1+2^{2p-2}(\mu_t(A_t))^{p-1}\Big)\\
&+2^{p-1}\|\,|\nabla f|\,\|_\infty^p e^{-pr_0s}e^{\frac{1}{2}pr_0t}(2^{p-1}+1).
\end{aligned}
$$

We recall that the family of measures $\{\mu_t : t\in I\}$ is tight. Therefore, since the radius of the ball B_t tends to $+\infty$ as $t\to+\infty$ and $A_t=\mathbb{R}^d\setminus B_t$, $\mu_t(A_t)$ tends to 0 as $t\to+\infty$. This shows that $\|G(t,s)f-m_s(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}$ vanishes as $t\to+\infty$.

Since $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ the statement follows. □

Remark 2.8. In the proof of the previous lemma the only property of the set of probability measures $\{\mu_s :\ s\in I\}$ that we use is the tightness. In particular, by (2.16) for every tight evolution system of measures $\{\nu_s :\ s\in I\}$ and for every $f\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the mean values of f with respect to μ_s and to ν_s are the pointwise limit of $G(t,s)f$ as $t\to+\infty$, so that they coincide for every s. Then, $\mu_s=\nu_s$, i.e., $\{\mu_s :\ s\in I\}$ is the *unique* tight evolution system of measures for $G(t,s)$.

3. Logarithmic Sobolev inequality

Throughout this section we set $0\log 0=0$. First of all, we prove a crucial preliminary lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that Hypotheses* 2.1(*i*)-(*iii*) *hold. Then:*

(i) *if $f\in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is constant outside a compact set $K\subset\mathbb{R}^d$, then the function $r\mapsto\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}f(x)\mu_r(dx)$ is continuously differentiable in I and*

$$\frac{d}{dr}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}f(x)\mu_r(dx)=-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\mathcal{A}(r)f)(x)\mu_r(dx),\qquad r\in I.$$

(ii) *Let $[a,b]\subset I$. If $f\in C_b^{1,2}([a,b]\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f(r,\cdot)$ is constant outside a compact set K for every $r\in[a,b]$, then the function $r\mapsto\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}f(r,x)\mu_r(dx)$ is continuously differentiable in $[a,b]$ and*

$$\frac{d}{dr}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}f(r,x)\mu_r(dx)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}D_rf(r,x)\mu_r(dx)-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\mathcal{A}(r)f(r,\cdot))(x)\mu_r(dx),$$

for every $r\in[a,b]$.

Proof. (i) To begin with, let us observe that, for any $t\in I$, the function $G(t,\cdot)\mathcal{A}(\cdot)f$ is continuous and bounded in $(I\cap(-\infty,t])\times\mathbb{R}^d=:I_t\times\mathbb{R}^d$. Indeed, for any $\sigma,\sigma_0\in I_t$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|(G(t,\sigma)\mathcal{A}(\sigma)f)(x)-(G(t,\sigma_0)\mathcal{A}(\sigma_0)f)(x_0)|\\
&\qquad\le|(G(t,\sigma)(\mathcal{A}(\sigma)f-\mathcal{A}(\sigma_0)f))(x)|\\
&\qquad\quad+|((G(t,\sigma)-G(t,\sigma_0))\mathcal{A}(\sigma_0)f)(x)|\\
&\qquad\quad+|(G(t,\sigma_0)\mathcal{A}(\sigma_0)f)(x)-(G(t,\sigma_0)\mathcal{A}(\sigma_0)f)(x_0)|\\
&\qquad\le\|\mathcal{A}(\sigma)f-\mathcal{A}(\sigma_0)f\|_\infty\\
&\qquad\quad+\|(G(t,\sigma)-G(t,\sigma_0))\mathcal{A}(\sigma_0)f\|_\infty\\
&\qquad\quad+|(G(t,\sigma_0)\mathcal{A}(\sigma_0)f)(x)-(G(t,\sigma_0)\mathcal{A}(\sigma_0)f)(x_0)|.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.1}
$$

Clearly, the first and the third addenda in the right-hand side of (3.1) vanish as $\sigma\to\sigma_0$ and $x\to x_0$, respectively. Concerning the second one, we observe that it tends to 0 as $\sigma\to\sigma_0$ since the function $G(t,\cdot)g$ is continuous in I_t with values in $C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for any $g\in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by [12, Lemma 3.2], and $\mathcal{A}(\sigma_0)f\in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Again by [12, Lemma 3.2], for $I\ni r$, $r+h<t$ we have

$$(G(t,r+h)f)(x)-(G(t,r)f)(x)=-\int_r^{r+h}(G(t,\sigma)\mathcal{A}(\sigma)f)(x)d\sigma.$$

Integrating over $\mathbb{R}^d$ with respect to μ_t, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Big((G(t,r+h)f)(x)-(G(t,r)f)(x)\Big)\mu_t(dx)\\ &=-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\bigg(\int_r^{r+h}(G(t,\sigma)\mathcal{A}(\sigma)f)(x)d\sigma\bigg)\mu_t(dx)\\ &=-\int_r^{r+h}\bigg(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,\sigma)\mathcal{A}(\sigma)f)(x)\mu_t(dx)\bigg)d\sigma.\end{aligned}\tag{3.2}$$

Using (1.4), (3.2) can be rewritten as

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}f(x)\mu_{r+h}(dx)-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}f(x)\mu_r(dx)=-\int_r^{r+h}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Big((\mathcal{A}(\sigma)f)(x)\mu_\sigma(dx)\Big)d\sigma.$$

Since the function $\sigma\mapsto\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\mathcal{A}(\sigma)f)(x)\mu_\sigma(dx)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,\sigma)\mathcal{A}(\sigma)f)(x)\mu_t(dx)$ is continuous in I_t, the claim follows dividing both sides by h and letting $h\to 0$.

(ii) For r, $r+h\in[a,b]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}f(r+h,x)\mu_{r+h}(dx)-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}f(r,x)\mu_r(dx)\\ =&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\big(f(r+h,x)-f(r,x)\big)\mu_{r+h}(dx)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}f(r,x)\mu_{r+h}(dx)-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}f(r,x)\mu_r(dx).\end{aligned}$$

The statement follows from (i) and from the continuity of the density ρ in $I\times\mathbb{R}^d$ (Lemma 2.4). ☐

In the proof of the LSI we will use also the next convergence lemma, a consequence of Lemma 2.7.

Proposition 3.2. *For every $f\in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with positive infimum,*

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f)(x)\log((G(t,s)f)(x))\mu_t(dx)=m_s(f)\log(m_s(f)),\qquad s\in I.\tag{3.3}$$

Proof. Since $G(t,s)$ preserves boundedness and positivity, $G(t,s)f$ is bounded and has positive values, for every $t>s$. Recalling that the function $y\mapsto y\log y$ is 1/2-Hölder continuous on bounded sets of $[0,+\infty)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f)(x)\log((G(t,s)f)(x))\mu_t(dx)-m_s(f)\log(m_s(f))\right|\\ &\quad=\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left((G(t,s)f)(x)\log((G(t,s)f)(x))-m_s(f)\log(m_s(f))\right)\mu_t(dx)\right|\\ &\quad\le C\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|(G(t,s)f)(x)-m_s(f)|^{1/2}\mu_t(dx),\end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant C. By the Hölder inequality,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|(G(t,s)f)(x)-m_s(f)|^{1/2}\mu_t(dx)\le\|G(t,s)f-m_s(f)\|^{1/2}_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}.$$

Then, the claim follows from Lemma 2.7. ☐

Now, we establish a logarithmic Sobolev inequality.

Theorem 3.3. *For every $f \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $p \in (1,+\infty)$ and $s \in I$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^p \log(|f|)\,\mu_s(dx) \leq &\frac{1}{p} m_s(|f|^p)\log(m_s(|f|^p))\\ &+\frac{p\Lambda}{2|r_0|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|f|^{p-2}|\nabla f|^2\chi_{\{f\neq 0\}}\mu_s(dx). \qquad (3.4)\end{aligned}$$

Proof. To achieve (3.4), we would like to follow the method of Deuschel and Stroock: differentiate the function

$$F(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f^p)(x)\log((G(t,s)f^p)(x))\mu_t(dx), \qquad t \geq s,$$

and prove that its derivative satisfies the inequality

$$F'(t) \geq -Ce^{-c(t-s)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^{p-2}|\nabla f|^2\mu_s(dx), \qquad t \geq s, \qquad (3.5)$$

for some positive constants C and c, independent of f. Then, the claim would follow by integrating (3.5) with respect to t from s to $+\infty$ and taking (3.3) into account. However, we have to overcome some difficulties due to the explicit time dependence of μ_t. By Lemma 3.1 we can differentiate the function $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g\mu_t(dx)$ if g is (smooth enough and) constant outside a compact set. But in general $G(t,s)f^p\log(G(t,s)f^p)$ is not constant outside any compact set. Then we have to introduce a sequence of cut-off functions θ_n in the integral that defines F, and this gives rise to several additional terms that have to be controlled.

We split the proof in two steps. In the first step we prove (3.4) for functions $f \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with positive infimum, then we extend the claim to general functions belonging to $C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Step 1. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\sup f \leq 1$. Indeed, for a general function $f \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with positive infimum, the claim follows applying (3.4) to the function $g = \frac{f}{\|f\|_\infty}$. Having $\sup f \leq 1$, we get $(G(t,s)f^p)(x)\log((G(t,s)f^p)(x)) \leq 0$ for $t > s$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and this will be useful to control one of the additional terms coming from the cut-off functions.

So, let $f \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $0 < \delta \leq f(x) \leq 1$ for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and fix $s \in I$, $p > 1$. Then, (2.6) implies $(G(t,s)f^p)(x) \in [\delta^p, 1]$ for every $t \geq s$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

The above mentioned cut-off functions are standard. We fix $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying $\chi_{(-\infty,1]} \leq \eta \leq \chi_{(-\infty,2]}$ and we set

$$\theta_n(x) = \eta\left(\frac{|x|}{n}\right), \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,\ n \in \mathbb{N}, \qquad (3.6)$$

$$F_n(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta_n(x)(G(t,s)f^p)(x)\log((G(t,s)f^p)(x))\mu_t(dx), \qquad t \geq s.$$

For every $t \geq s$, $F_n(t)$ converges to $F(t)$ as $n \to +\infty$, by dominated convergence. Moreover, the function $(t,x) \mapsto \theta_n(x)(G(t,s)f^p)(x)\log((G(t,s)f^p)(x))$ is continuous and bounded in $[s,+\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d$, and it satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 3.1(ii) for any interval $[a,b] \subset (s,+\infty)$. Then, Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 3.1(ii) yield that F_n is continuous in $[s,+\infty)$ and differentiable in $(s,+\infty)$, respectively. After a long but straightforward computation, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}F_n(t) = &-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta_n\frac{\langle Q(t)\nabla_x G(t,s)f^p, \nabla_x G(t,s)f^p\rangle}{G(t,s)f^p}\mu_t(dx)\\ &-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f^p)\log(G(t,s)f^p)\mathrm{Tr}(Q(t)D^2\theta_n)\mu_t(dx)\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f^p)\log(G(t,s)f^p)\langle b(t,\cdot),\nabla\theta_n\rangle\,\mu_t(dx)\\
&-2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\langle Q(t)\nabla\theta_n,\nabla_x G(t,s)f^p\rangle(\log(G(t,s)f^p)+1)\mu_t(dx)\\
=:&I_1(t,n)+I_2(t,n)+I_3(t,n)+I_4(t,n),\qquad t>s. \qquad (3.7)
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, since $I_k(\cdot,n)$ $(k=1,\dots,4)$ are bounded in (s,t) for any $t>s$ and F_n is continuous in $[s,+\infty)$,

$$
F_n(t)-F_n(s)=\sum_{k=1}^{4}\int_s^t I_k(\sigma,n)\,d\sigma,\qquad t\ge s. \qquad (3.8)
$$

We claim that

$$
F(t)-F(s)\ge\int_s^t g(\sigma)d\sigma,\qquad t\ge s, \qquad (3.9)
$$

where

$$
g(\sigma)=-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{\langle Q(\sigma)\nabla_x G(\sigma,s)f^p,\nabla_x G(\sigma,s)f^p\rangle}{G(\sigma,s)f^p}\mu_\sigma(dx),\qquad \sigma\ge s.
$$

By (2.9) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|I_1(\sigma,n)-g(\sigma)|=&\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\theta_n-1)\frac{\langle Q(\sigma)\nabla_x G(\sigma,s)f^p,\nabla_x G(\sigma,s)f^p\rangle}{G(\sigma,s)f^p}\mu_\sigma(dx)\right|\\
\le&\Lambda\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\theta_n-1|\frac{|\nabla_x G(\sigma,s)f^p|^2}{G(\sigma,s)f^p}\mu_\sigma(dx)\\
\le&\Lambda e^{2r_0(\sigma-s)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\theta_n-1|\frac{(G(\sigma,s)|\nabla f^p|)^2}{G(\sigma,s)f^p}\mu_\sigma(dx),
\end{aligned}
$$

for every $\sigma\ge s$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}$. The Hölder inequality and formula (2.6) imply

$$
G(\sigma,s)|\nabla f^p|\le\left(G(\sigma,s)\frac{|\nabla f^p|^2}{f^p}\right)^{1/2}(G(\sigma,s)f^p)^{1/2},\qquad \sigma\ge s.
$$

Thus,

$$
\begin{aligned}
|I_1(\sigma,n)-g(\sigma)|\le&\Lambda e^{2r_0(\sigma-s)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\theta_n-1|G(\sigma,s)\left(\frac{|\nabla f^p|^2}{f^p}\right)\mu_\sigma(dx)\\
\le&\Lambda e^{2r_0(\sigma-s)}\left\|\frac{|\nabla f^p|^2}{f^p}\right\|_\infty\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\theta_n-1|\mu_\sigma(dx),
\end{aligned}
$$

and consequently $\lim_{n\to+\infty}I_1(\sigma,n)=g(\sigma)$ for every $\sigma\ge s$. Moreover, $|I_1(\sigma,n)|\le\Lambda p^2\|f^{p-2}|\nabla f|^2\|_\infty$. Integrating between s and t, by dominated convergence we obtain

$$
\lim_{n\to+\infty}\int_s^t I_1(\sigma,n)d\sigma=\int_s^t g(\sigma)d\sigma,\qquad t\ge s. \qquad (3.10)
$$

Let us consider $I_2(\cdot,n)$. For $\sigma\in I$ and $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Tr}(Q(\sigma)D^2\theta_n(x))=&\eta''\left(\frac{|x|}{n}\right)\frac{\langle Q(\sigma)x,x\rangle}{n^2|x|^2}+\eta'\left(\frac{|x|}{n}\right)\frac{\mathrm{Tr}(Q(\sigma))}{n|x|}\\
&-\eta'\left(\frac{|x|}{n}\right)\frac{\langle Q(\sigma)x,x\rangle}{n|x|^3}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Recalling that the supports of η' and η'' are contained in $[1,2]$, we get

$$
|\mathrm{Tr}(Q(\sigma)D^2\theta_n(x))|\le\frac{C_1}{n^2},\qquad \sigma\in I,
$$

where $C_1 = d\Lambda(2\|\eta'\|_\infty + \|\eta''\|_\infty)$. Then,

$$|I_2(\sigma, n)| \le p|\log(\delta)|\frac{C_1}{n^2}, \qquad \sigma \ge s, \ n \in \mathbb{N},$$

which implies

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \int_s^t I_2(\sigma, n)d\sigma = 0, \qquad t \ge s. \tag{3.11}$$

Fix now $T > s$ and consider $I_3(\sigma, n)$ for $s \le \sigma \le T$. Again, since the support of η' is contained in $[1, 2]$ and $\eta' \le 0$, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\langle b(\sigma, x), \nabla\theta_n(x)\rangle = \eta'\left(\frac{|x|}{n}\right)\frac{\langle b(\sigma, x), x\rangle}{n|x|} \ge \eta'\left(\frac{|x|}{n}\right)\frac{C_{s,T}}{n^2}, \tag{3.12}$$

where $C_{s,T}$ is the constant in (2.5). Recalling that $-(G(\sigma, s)f^p)\log(G(\sigma, s)f^p) \ge 0$ because $f^p \le 1$, we obtain

$$I_3(\sigma, n) \ge -\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (G(\sigma, s)f^p)\log(G(\sigma, s)f^p)\eta'\left(\frac{|x|}{n}\right)\frac{C_{s,T}}{n^2}\mu_\sigma(dx), \qquad s \le \sigma \le T.$$

On the other hand,

$$\left|(G(\sigma, s)f^p)\log(G(\sigma, s)f^p)\eta'\left(\frac{|x|}{n}\right)\frac{C_{s,T}}{n^2}\right| \le p|\log\delta|\frac{C_{s,T}\|\eta'\|_\infty}{n^2} := \frac{C_2}{n^2},$$

and therefore

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \int_s^t I_3(\sigma, n)d\sigma \ge 0, \qquad s \le t \le T,$$

and since T is arbitrary,

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \int_s^t I_3(\sigma, n)d\sigma \ge 0, \qquad t \ge s. \tag{3.13}$$

$I_4(\cdot, n)$ tends to 0 as $n \to +\infty$, uniformly in $[s, +\infty)$, since (2.9) yields

$$\begin{aligned}|I_4(\sigma, n)| \le& 2\Lambda\frac{\|\eta'\|_\infty}{n}e^{r_0(\sigma-s)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(\sigma, s)|\nabla f^p|)|\log(G(\sigma, s)f^p) + 1|\mu_\sigma(dx)\\ \le& 2\Lambda\frac{\|\eta'\|_\infty}{n}\| \, |\nabla f^p| \, \|_\infty\left(p|\log(\delta)| + 1\right),\end{aligned}$$

for every $\sigma \ge s$. Hence,

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \int_s^t I_4(\sigma, n)d\sigma = 0, \qquad t \ge s. \tag{3.14}$$

Taking into account (3.10), (3.11), (3.13), (3.14) and letting $n \to +\infty$ in (3.8), formula (3.9) follows. Now, since

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\langle Q(\sigma)\nabla_x G(\sigma, s)f^p, \nabla_x G(\sigma, s)f^p\rangle}{G(\sigma, s)f^p}\mu_\sigma(dx) \le& \Lambda e^{2r_0(\sigma-s)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(\sigma, s)\frac{|\nabla f^p|^2}{f^p}\mu_\sigma(dx)\\ =& \Lambda p^2 e^{2r_0(\sigma-s)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^{p-2}|\nabla f|^2\mu_s(dx),\end{aligned}$$

we get, for $t \ge s$,

$$\begin{aligned}F(t) - F(s) \ge& -\Lambda p^2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^{p-2}|\nabla f|^2\mu_s(dx)\int_s^t e^{2r_0(\sigma-s)}d\sigma\\ =& \frac{\Lambda p^2}{2r_0}\left(1 - e^{2r_0(t-s)}\right)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^{p-2}|\nabla f|^2\mu_s(dx).\end{aligned}$$

Letting $t \to +\infty$ and recalling (3.3) yields

$$m_s(f^p)\log(m_s(f^p)) - F(s) \ge \frac{\Lambda p^2}{2r_0}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^{p-2}|\nabla f|^2\mu_s(dx),$$

that is,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^p \log f^p \, \mu_s(dx) \le m_s(f^p)\log(m_s(f^p)) + \frac{\Lambda p^2}{2|r_0|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^{p-2}|\nabla f|^2 \mu_s(dx),$$

which coincides with (3.4) in our case.

Step 2. Let now $f \in C^1_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and define $f_n := (f^2 + n^{-1})^{1/2}$. By the first part of the proof we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_n^p \log(f_n^p)\, \mu_s(dx) \le m_s(f_n^p)\log(m_s(f_n^p)) + \frac{\Lambda p^2}{2|r_0|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_n^{p-2}|\nabla f_n|^2 \mu_s(dx), \quad (3.15)$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \in I$. Since $0 < f_n^p \le \|f^2+1\|_\infty^{p/2}$, the left-hand side of (3.15) converges to $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^p \log|f|^p \, \mu_s(dx)$. Similarly, by dominated convergence we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} m_s(f_n^p)\log(m_s(f_n^p)) = m_s(|f|^p)\log(m_s(|f|^p)).$$

Observe that $|\nabla f_n|^2 \le |\nabla f|^2$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$; by the monotone convergence theorem, if $p < 2$, and by dominated convergence, otherwise, we get

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_n^{p-2}|\nabla f_n|^2\mu_s(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^{p-2}|\nabla f|^2\chi_{\{f\neq 0\}}\mu_s(dx),$$

and the statement follows letting $n \to +\infty$ in (3.15). □

The logarithmic Sobolev inequality (3.4) yields some compactness results.

Theorem 3.4. *Fix $s \in I$. Then:*

(i) *$W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu_s)$ is compactly embedded in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu_s)$ for any $p \in [2, +\infty)$;*
(ii) *for any $t > s$ and $p \in (1, +\infty)$, the operator $G(t, s) : L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu_s) \to L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu_t)$ is compact.*

Proof. (i) Let μ be a Borel measure in $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that for every $R > 0$ and $p \ge 2$, $L^p(B(0,R), \mu) = L^p(B(0,R), dx)$ with equivalence of the corresponding norms (which is true for our measures μ_s). It is known that the occurrence of a logarithmic Sobolev inequality for μ yields compactness of the embedding $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu) \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu)$, see e.g., [16]. The proof for $p \ge 2$ is not much different, we write it here for the reader's convenience.

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a ball in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu_s)$. We prove that $\mathcal{B}$ is totally bounded in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu_s)$. For this purpose, we fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and claim that there exists $R > 0$ such that

$$\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d\setminus B(0,R),\mu_s)} \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \qquad f \in \mathcal{B}. \quad (3.16)$$

For any fixed $f \in \mathcal{B}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we introduce the set $E_k = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |f(x)| \le k\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d\setminus B(0,R)} |f|^p d\mu_s &= \int_{E_k\cap(\mathbb{R}^d\setminus B(0,R))} |f|^p d\mu_s + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\setminus(B(0,R)\cup E_k)} |f|^p d\mu_s \\ &\le k^p \mu_s(\mathbb{R}^d\setminus B(0,R)) + \frac{1}{\log(k)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^p\log(|f|)d\mu_s.\end{aligned}$$

By the logarithmic Sobolev inequality (3.4) (which can be extended to any $g \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu_s)$ by Lemma 2.5, since $p \ge 2$) and the Hölder inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^p\log(|f|)d\mu_s \le& \|f\|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}\log(\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}) \\ &+ \frac{p\Lambda}{2|r_0|}\|f\|^{p-2}_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}\|\,|\nabla f|\,\|^2_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)} \\ \le& K,\end{aligned}$$

for some $K > 0$. Therefore,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d\setminus B(0,R)} |f|^p d\mu_s \le k^p \mu_s(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(0,R)) + \frac{K}{\log k}, \qquad f \in \mathcal{B}.$$

The claim follows choosing properly k and R.

By Lemma 2.4 the density of μ_s with respect to the Lebesgue measure is a continuous and positive function. Since, as we have already recalled the spaces $L^p(B(0,R),\mu_s)$ and $L^p(B(0,R),dx)$ (and, hence, the spaces $W^{1,p}(B(0,R),\mu_s)$ and $W^{1,p}(B(0,R),dx)$) coincide, and the corresponding norms are equivalent, by the Rellich-Kondrachov theorem there exists a finite number of functions $f_1,\dots,f_m$ in $L^p(B(0,R),\mu_s)$ such that

$$\mathcal{B}_{|B(0,R)} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^m \left\{ f \in L^p(B(0,R),\mu_s) : \|f - f_j\|_{L^p(B(0,R),\mu_s)} \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{|B(0,R)}$ denotes the set of the restrictions to $B(0,R)$ of the functions in $\mathcal{B}$. Using (3.16) it is easy to check that $\mathcal{B}$ is contained in the union of the closed balls in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ centered at $\widetilde{f}_j$, with radius ε, where $\widetilde{f}_j$ denotes the trivial extension of f_j to the whole of $\mathbb{R}^d$.

(ii) The proof follows by interpolation. Indeed, by estimate (2.10), $G(t,s)$ maps $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ to $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$ and $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$ is compactly embedded in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$, for every $p \ge 2$. Hence, $G(t,s)$ is a compact operator from $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$ for every $p \ge 2$. Moreover, $G(t,s)$ is also a linear bounded operator from $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ to $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$. Then, the claim follows arguing as in [5, Thm. 1.6.1] with $A = G(t,s)$ and with obvious modifications. ☐

4. HYPERCONTRACTIVITY OF $G(t,s)$

The LSI inequality is the main tool in the proof of the following hypercontractivity theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $s \in I$, $p,q \in (1,+\infty)$ with $p \le e^{2\eta_0|r_0|\Lambda^{-1}(t-s)}(q-1)+1$. Then, $G(t,s)$ maps $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$ for every $t > s$ and*

$$\|G(t,s)f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)} \le \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}, \qquad t > s,\ f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s). \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. The proof is in two steps. In the first step we show that (4.1) holds for every positive $f \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which is constant outside a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. In the second step we extend (4.1) to all $f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$.

Step 1. Let $f \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be constant outside a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and have positive values. Fix $q > 1$, $s \in I$ and set $p(t) := e^{2\eta_0|r_0|\Lambda^{-1}(t-s)}(q-1)+1$. Our aim is to show that the function

$$\beta(t) := \|G(t,s)f\|_{L^{p(t)}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}, \qquad t \ge s,$$

is decreasing. This will imply $\|G(t,s)f\|_{L^{p(t)}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)} \le \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}$, and for $p < p(t)$ (4.1) will follow from the Hölder inequality.

Let θ_n be the cut-off functions defined in (3.6). By [12, Thm. 2.2, Step 1], $(t,x) \mapsto (G(t,s)f)(x) \in C^{1,2}([s,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, Lemma 3.1(ii) yields that the function

$$t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \theta_n (G(t,s)f)^{p(t)} \mu_t(dx), \qquad t \ge s,$$

is differentiable in $[s,+\infty)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with derivative given by

$$p'(t)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \theta (G(t,s)f)^{p(t)} \log(G(t,s)f)\mu_t(dx)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&- p(t)(p(t)-1)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)-2}\langle Q(t)\nabla_x G(t,s)f,\nabla_x G(t,s)f\rangle\mu_t(dx)\\
&- 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\langle Q(t)\nabla_x((G(t,s)f)^{p(t)}),\nabla\theta\rangle\mu_t(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)}\mathcal{A}(t)\theta\mu_t(dx). \qquad (4.2)
\end{aligned}
$$

Let us define the functions β_n by

$$
\beta_n(t) := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta_n(x)((G(t,s)f)(x))^{p(t)}\mu_t(dx)\right)^{\frac{1}{p(t)}}, \qquad t\in[s,+\infty).
$$

Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta_n'(t) = \beta_n(t)\bigg[&-\frac{p'(t)}{(p(t))^2}\log\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta_n(x)((G(t,s)f)(x))^{p(t)}\mu_t(dx)\right)\\
&+\frac{1}{p(t)}\beta_n(t)^{-p(t)}\frac{d}{dt}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta_n(x)((G(t,s)f)(x))^{p(t)}\mu_t(dx)\right)\bigg].
\end{aligned}
$$

Replacing (4.2) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta_n'(t) =&\beta_n(t)\bigg\{-\frac{p'(t)}{(p(t))^2}\log\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta_n(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)}\mu_t(dx)\right)\\
&+\frac{1}{p(t)(\beta_n(t))^{p(t)}}\bigg[p'(t)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta_n(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)}\log(G(t,s)f)\mu_t(dx)\\
&-p(t)(p(t)-1)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta_n(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)-2}\langle Q(t)\nabla_x G(t,s)f,\nabla_x G(t,s)f\rangle\mu_t(dx)\\
&-2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\langle Q(t)\nabla_x((G(t,s)f)^{p(t)}),\nabla\theta_n\rangle\mu_t(dx)\\
&-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)}\mathcal{A}(t)\theta_n\mu_t(dx)\bigg]\bigg\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Let us fix $T>s$ and note that by (3.12) we have

$$
(\mathcal{A}(t)\theta_n)(x)\ge \mathrm{Tr}(Q(t)D^2\theta_n(x))+\eta'\left(\frac{|x|}{n}\right)\frac{C_{s,T}}{n^2}, \qquad s\le t\le T,\ x\in\mathbb{R}^d.
$$

Hence, for $s\le t\le T$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta_n'(t)\le\gamma_n(t) :=& \beta_n(t)\bigg\{-\frac{p'(t)}{p^2(t)}\log\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta_n(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)}\mu_t(dx)\right)\\
&+\frac{1}{p(t)(\beta_n(t))^{p(t)}}\bigg[p'(t)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta_n(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)}\log(G(t,s)f)\mu_t(dx)\\
&-p(t)(p(t)-1)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta_n(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)-2}\langle Q(t)\nabla_x G(t,s)f,\nabla_x G(t,s)f\rangle\mu_t(dx)\\
&-2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\langle Q(t)\nabla_x((G(t,s)f)^{p(t)}),\nabla\theta_n\rangle\mu_t(dx)\\
&-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}((G(t,s)f)(x))^{p(t)}\left(\mathrm{Tr}(Q(t)D^2\theta_n(x))+\eta'\left(\frac{|x|}{n}\right)\frac{C_{s,T}}{n^2}\right)\mu_t(dx)\bigg]\bigg\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, for $s\le t_1<t_2\le T$ we have

$$
\beta_n(t_2)-\beta_n(t_1)\le\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\gamma_n(s)ds. \qquad (4.3)
$$

Our claim will be proved letting $n\to+\infty$ in (4.3). To this aim we note that

$$
|\beta_n(t)-\beta(t)|\le\|(\theta_n-1)G(t,s)f\|_{L^{p(t)}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\le\|f\|_\infty\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\theta_n-1|\mu_t(dx)\right)^{1/p(t)},
$$

which shows that $\beta_n(t)$ tends to $\beta(t)$ for $t\in[s,T]$, as $n\to+\infty$. Moreover, $|\beta_n(t)|\le \|f\|_\infty$ for $t\ge s$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}$.

Let us prove that γ_n converges pointwise in $[s,T]$ to the function γ defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma(t):=&\beta(t)\bigg[-\frac{p'(t)}{p^2(t)}\log\bigg(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)}\mu_t(dx)\bigg)\\&+\frac{1}{p(t)(\beta(t))^{p(t)}}\bigg(p'(t)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)}\log(G(t,s)f)\mu_t(dx)\\&-p(t)(p(t)-1)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)-2}\langle Q(t)\nabla_xG(t,s)f,\nabla_xG(t,s)f\rangle\mu_t(dx)\bigg)\bigg],\end{aligned}$$

and that there exists a positive constant C_1 such that $|\gamma_n(t)|\le C_1$ for each $t\in[s,T]$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}$. We have to discuss convergence and estimates just for

$$I_{1,n}(t):=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta_n(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)}\log(G(t,s)f)\mu_t(dx)$$

and

$$I_{2,n}(t):=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\theta_n(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)-2}\langle Q(t)\nabla_xG(t,s)f,\nabla_xG(t,s)f\rangle\mu_t(dx),$$

since the other terms are easier to deal with: it is enough to recall that $\|\,|\nabla\theta_n|\,\|_\infty\le Cn^{-1}$ and $|\mathrm{Tr}(Q(t)D^2\theta_n(x))|\le C_1n^{-2}$, $|\eta'(|x|/n)C_{s,T}n^{-2}|\le\|\eta'\|_\infty C_{s,T}n^{-2}$, as it has been already done in the proof of Theorem 3.3.

Concerning $I_{1,n}(t)$, we observe that

$$0<(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)}\log(G(t,s)f)\le\max\{\xi^{p(t)}\log\xi:\ t\in[s,T],\ 0<\xi\le\|f\|_\infty\}=:H,$$

and hence

$$\bigg|I_{1,n}(t)-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)}\log(G(t,s)f)\mu_t(dx)\bigg|\le H\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\theta_n-1|\mu_t(dx).$$

The right hand side vanishes as $n\to+\infty$, and it is bounded by H for every $t\in[s,T]$.

Next, we consider $I_{2,n}(t)$ and we note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\bigg|I_{2,n}(t)-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)-2}\langle Q(t)\nabla_xG(t,s)f,\nabla_xG(t,s)f\rangle\mu_t(dx)\bigg|\\\le&\Lambda\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\theta_n-1|(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)-2}|\nabla_xG(t,s)f|^2\mu_t(dx).\end{aligned}\tag{4.4}$$

Using (2.9) and, if $p(t)<2$, the inequality $G(t,s)f\ge G(t,s)(\inf f)=\inf f>0$, that follows from (2.6), we easily deduce that the right-hand side of (4.4) vanishes as $n\to+\infty$. Moreover,

$$|I_{2,n}(t)|\le\Lambda\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)-2}|\nabla_xG(t,s)f|^2\mu_t(dx),\qquad t\in[s,T],\ n\in\mathbb{N}.$$

Then, we may let $n\to+\infty$ in (4.3) and conclude that for $s\le t_1<t_2\le T$ we have

$$\beta(t_2)-\beta(t_1)\le\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\gamma(s)ds,$$

and since $T>s$ is arbitrary, the inequality holds for every $s\le t_1<t_2$.

Applying the logarithmic Sobolev inequality (3.4) to the function $G(t,s)f$ we get, for $t>s$,

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma(t)\le\beta(t)^{1-p(t)}\bigg(&\frac{p'(t)\Lambda}{2|r_0|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)-2}|\nabla_xG(t,s)f|^2\mu_t(dx)\\&-(p(t)-1)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)-2}\langle Q(t)\nabla_xG(t,s)f,\nabla_xG(t,s)f\rangle\mu_t(dx)\bigg)\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \beta(t)^{1-p(t)}\left(\frac{p'(t)\Lambda}{2|r_0|}-(p(t)-1)\eta_0\right)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G(t,s)f)^{p(t)-2}|\nabla_x G(t,s)f|^2\mu_t(dx)$$
$$=0,$$

by the definition of $p(t)$. Hence, $\beta(t_2)\leq\beta(t_1)$.

Step 2. Let $f\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and consider the sequence of functions

$$f_n(x)=\sqrt{|f(x)|^2+\frac{1}{n}},\qquad x\in\mathbb{R}^d,\ n\in\mathbb{N}.$$

Each f_n belongs to $C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, it has positive values and it is constant outside a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. By Step 1, for $p\leq e^{2\eta_0|r_0|\Lambda^{-1}(t-s)}(q-1)+1$ we have

$$\|G(t,s)f_n\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\leq\|f_n\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)},\qquad t\geq s.$$

Since f_n converges to $|f|$ uniformly in $\mathbb{R}^d$, f_n and $G(t,s)f_n$ converge to $|f|$ and $G(t,s)|f|$ in $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)$ and in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$, respectively, as $n\to+\infty$. Therefore,

$$\|G(t,s)f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\leq\|G(t,s)|f|\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\leq\|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}.\tag{4.5}$$

For a general $f\in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ estimate (4.5) follows by density, approximating f by a sequence $(f_n)_n\subset C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. ☐

5. Poincaré inequality and asymptotic behavior

This section is devoted to prove the Poincaré inequality for the measures μ_t and to the study of the decay rate of $G(t,s)-m_s$ for $p>1$.

The Poincaré inequality (5.7) could be proved by contradiction, through a classical argument (see e.g., [7, Thm. 5.8.1]) that exploits the compactness of the embedding $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)\hookrightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$. However, this procedure does not allow to control the dependence of the constant C_p below on s, whereas in the proof of the next Theorem 5.3 we need C_2 to be independent of s. Hence, we use different arguments. In particular, we use the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\mu(dx)=\rho(x)dx$ be a probability measure in $\mathbb{R}^d$, where ρ is a locally bounded function with positive infimum on every ball, and denote by $m(f)$ the mean value of $f\in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)$ with respect to μ. Assume that a Poincaré inequality holds for $p=2$, that is*

$$\|f-m(f)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}\leq C\|\,|\nabla f|\,\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)},\qquad f\in W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu).\tag{5.1}$$

Then for every $p>2$ there is $C_p>0$, depending only on C and p, such that

$$\|f-m(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}\leq C_p\|\,|\nabla f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)},\qquad f\in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu).\tag{5.2}$$

Proof. As a first step, we prove that there exists a positive constant K_p such that

$$\|g\|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}\leq K_p\,\|\,|\nabla g|\,\|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}+2\|g\|^p_{L^{p/2}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)},\qquad g\in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu).\tag{5.3}$$

Since $p>2$, for every $g\in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)$ the function $|g|^{p/2}$ belongs to $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)$. This can be proved approaching g by a sequence of functions in $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which is dense in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)$ by Lemma 2.4.

Applying the Poincaré inequality (5.1) to $|g|^{p/2}$ yields

$$\|g\|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}\leq\frac{(pC)^2}{4}\|g\|^{p-2}_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}\|\,|\nabla g|\,\|^2_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}+\|g\|^p_{L^{p/2}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}.$$

Using the Young inequality $a^{1-2/p}b^{2/p}\leq\varepsilon a+C_{\varepsilon,p}b$ with $a=\|g\|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}$, $b=\|\,|\nabla g|\,\|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}$, and choosing $\varepsilon=2(pC)^{-2}$, we get (5.3) for some positive constant K_p depending only on C and p.

If $p \in (2,4]$ we are done: since $p/2 \le 2$, we have $\|g\|_{L^{p/2}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)} \le \|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}$ and (5.3) yields

$$\|g\|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)} \le K_p \| \, |\nabla g| \, \|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)} + 2\|g\|^p_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}, \qquad g \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu). \tag{5.4}$$

Taking $g = f - m(f)$ with any $f \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)$ we get

$$\|f - m(f)\|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)} \le K_p \| \, |\nabla f| \, \|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)} + 2\|f - m(f)\|^p_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}. \tag{5.5}$$

Using again (5.1) and $\| \, |\nabla f| \, \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)} \le \| \, |\nabla f| \, \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}$, (5.5) yields

$$\|f - m(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)} \le \widetilde{K}_p \| \, |\nabla f| \, \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}, \qquad f \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu), \qquad 2 < p \le 4, \tag{5.6}$$

with some positive constant $\widetilde{K}_p$ depending only on C and p, i.e., (5.2) holds true for $2 < p \le 4$.

Let now $p \in [4,8)$. For any $f \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)$ we apply (5.3) to the function $g = f - m(f)$, and since $p/2 \in [2,4)$, we may use (5.6) with $p/2$ instead of p, to get (5.2).

Iterating this procedure, we get (5.2) for any $p > 2$. ☐

Theorem 5.2. *For every $p \ge 2$, there exists a positive constant C_p such that*

$$\|f - m_s(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)} \le C_p \| \, |\nabla f| \, \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}, \tag{5.7}$$

for any $f \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ and any $s \in I$. In particular, if $p = 2$, we can take $C_2 = \Lambda^{1/2}|r_0|^{-1/2}$, where Λ and r_0 are defined in Hypotheses 2.1.

Proof. For $p = 2$, estimate (5.7) follows from the LSI (3.4) by [20]. For the reader's convenience we give a sketch of the proof. Let $f \in C^1_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $m_s(f) = 0$. Replacing f by $f_\varepsilon := 1 + \varepsilon f$ in the inequality (3.4) with $p = 2$ yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_\varepsilon^2 (\log f_\varepsilon^2) \mu_s(dx) - \|f_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)} \log(\|f_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}) = 2\varepsilon^2 \|f_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)} + o(\varepsilon^2),$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0^+$. Thus, by (3.4) we get (5.7). If $m_s(f) \ne 0$ it suffices to consider the function $f - m_s(f)$. Since $C^1_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ (see Lemma 2.5) the claim follows.

For $p > 2$, the statement follows from Lemma 5.1. ☐

Next theorem shows how the decay of $G(t,s) - m_s$ to 0 is related to the decay of $\nabla_x G(t,s)$ to 0. A similar result has been proved in [14, Thm. 3.6] in the case of time periodic coefficients under stronger assumptions than ours, and only for $p \ge 2$. The approach of [14] is different from the present one, since it relies on the use of the evolution semigroup associated to the evolution family $G(t,s)$.

For $p \ge 1$ we define the sets $\mathfrak{A}_p$ and $\mathfrak{B}_p$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{A}_p =& \big\{\omega \in \mathbb{R} : \exists M_{p,\omega} > 0 \text{ s.t. } \|G(t,s)f - m_s(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)} \le M_{p,\omega} e^{\omega(t-s)} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)},\\ & I \ni s < t, \ f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)\big\};\\ \mathfrak{B}_p =& \big\{\omega \in \mathbb{R} : \exists N_{p,\omega} > 0 \text{ s.t. } \| \, |\nabla_x G(t,s)f| \, \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)} \le N_{p,\omega} e^{\omega(t-s)} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)},\\ & s,t \in I, \ t - s \ge 1, \ f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 5.3. *The sets $\mathfrak{A}_p$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ are independent of $p \in (1,+\infty)$, and they coincide.*

Proof. As a first step we prove that $\mathfrak{A}_p$ and $\mathfrak{B}_p$ are independent of $p \in (1,+\infty)$. Then, we prove that $\mathfrak{A}_2 = \mathfrak{B}_2$, which yields the conclusion.

Step 1. To prove that $\mathfrak{A}_p$ is independent of p we use the hypercontractivity of $G(t,s)$. Fix $p_1>1$ and set $p_2=e^{2\eta_0|r_0|\Lambda^{-1}}(p_1-1)+1$. Clearly, $p_1<p_2$. Let $p\in(p_1,p_2]$. From (4.1) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\|G(t,s)f-m_s(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}=&\|G(t,t-1)(G(t-1,s)f-m_s(f))\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\\ \leq&\|G(t-1,s)f-m_s(f)\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_{t-1})},\end{aligned}$$

for any $f\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$. If $\omega\in\mathfrak{A}_{p_1}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|G(t-1,s)f-m_s(f)\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_{t-1})}\leq&M_{p_1,\omega}e^{\omega(t-s-1)}\|f\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}\\ \leq&M_{p_1,\omega}e^{\omega(t-s-1)}\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)},\end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant $M_{p_1,\omega}$, independent of f. Then,

$$\|G(t,s)f-m_s(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\leq M_{p_1,\omega}e^{\omega(t-s-1)}\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)},$$

so that $\mathfrak{A}_{p_1}\subset\mathfrak{A}_p$.

On the other hand, for $t>s+1$, $\omega\in\mathfrak{A}_p$ and $f\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$, using again (4.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|G(t,s)f-m_s(f)\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\leq&\|G(t,s)f-m_s(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\\ =&\|G(t,s+1)G(s+1,s)f-m_s(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\\ =&\|G(t,s+1)G(s+1,s)f-m_{s+1}(G(s+1,s)f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\\ \leq&M_{p,\omega}e^{\omega(t-s-1)}\|G(s+1,s)f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_{s+1})}\\ \leq&M_{p,\omega}e^{\omega(t-s-1)}\|f\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)},\end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant $M_{p,\omega}$. As above, we conclude that $\omega\in\mathfrak{A}_{p_1}$ so that $\mathfrak{A}_p\subset\mathfrak{A}_{p_1}$.

We have thus proved that $\mathfrak{A}_p=\mathfrak{A}_{p_1}$ for any $p\in(p_1,p_2]$. Starting from p_2, the same arguments yield $\mathfrak{A}_p=\mathfrak{A}_{p_2}=\mathfrak{A}_{p_1}$ for any $p\in[p_2,p_3]$, where $p_3=e^{2\eta_0|r_0|\Lambda^{-1}}(p_2-1)+1$. Note that the sequence defined recursively by $p_1>1$, $p_{k+1}=e^{2\eta_0|r_0|\Lambda^{-1}}(p_k-1)+1$ has limit $+\infty$ as $k\to+\infty$. Hence, iterating this argument we obtain $\mathfrak{A}_p=\mathfrak{A}_{p_1}$ for any $p\in[p_1,+\infty)$. Since $p_1\in(1,+\infty)$ is arbitrary, $\mathfrak{A}_p$ is independent of $p\in(1,+\infty)$.

In a similar way we prove that $\mathfrak{B}_p$ is independent of $p\in(1,+\infty)$. Indeed, let p_1, p_2 and p be as above. If $\omega\in\mathfrak{B}_{p_1}$ and $t-s\geq 2$, using (2.9) and (4.1) we get, for $f\in C^1_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\,|\nabla_xG(t,s)f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}=&\|\,|\nabla_xG(t,t-1)G(t-1,s)f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\\ \leq&\|G(t,t-1)|\nabla_xG(t-1,s)f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\\ \leq&\|\,|\nabla_xG(t-1,s)f|\,\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_{t-1})}\\ \leq&N_{p_1,\omega}e^{\omega(t-s-1)}\|f\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}\\ \leq&N_{p_1,\omega}e^{\omega(t-s-1)}\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)},\end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant $N_{p_1,\omega}$, independent of f, s and t. Since $C^1_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$ the estimate holds for every $f\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$. Similarly, if $\omega\in\mathfrak{B}_p$ and $t-s\geq 2$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\|\,|\nabla_xG(t,s)f|\,\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\leq&\|\,|\nabla_xG(t,s)f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\\ =&\|\,|\nabla_xG(t,s+1)G(s+1,s)f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\\ \leq&N_{p,\omega}e^{\omega(t-s-1)}\|G(s+1,s)f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_{s+1})}\\ \leq&N_{p,\omega}e^{\omega(t-s-1)}\|f\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)},\end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant $N_{p,\omega}$, independent of $f\in L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)$, s and t.

Then, $\mathfrak{B}_p = \mathfrak{B}_{p_1}$ for any $p \in (p_1, p_2]$. Iterating this argument as above, we conclude that $\mathfrak{B}_p$ is independent of $p \in (1, +\infty)$.

Step 2. Let us prove that $\mathfrak{A}_2 = \mathfrak{B}_2$. Fix $\omega \in \mathfrak{A}_2$, $s, t \in I$, with $t - s \geq 1$, and $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu_s)$ with $m_s(f) = 0$. Splitting $G(t,s)f = G(t,t-1)G(t-1,s)f$ and using (2.10) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\| \, |\nabla_x G(t,s)f| \, \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)} =& \| \, |\nabla_x G(t,t-1)G(t-1,s)f| \, \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)} \\ \leq & c_2 \|G(t-1,s)f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_{t-1})} \\ \leq & c_2 M_{2,\omega} e^{\omega(t-s)} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}.\end{aligned}$$

If $m_s(f) \neq 0$ it suffices to apply the above estimate to $f - m_s(f)$ and recall that $\|f - m_s(f)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)} \leq 2\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}$. Hence, $\omega \in \mathfrak{B}_2$, so that $\mathfrak{A}_2 \subset \mathfrak{B}_2$.

Conversely, fix $\omega \in \mathfrak{B}_2$, $s, t \in I$, with $t - s \geq 1$ and $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu_s)$. Applying the Poincaré inequality (5.7) (with μ_s and f replaced by μ_t and $G(t,s)f$, respectively) and observing that $m_t(G(t,s)f) = m_s(f)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|G(t,s)f - m_s(f)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)} =& \|G(t,s)f - m_t(G(t,s)f)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)} \\ \leq & C_2 \| \, |\nabla_x G(t,s)f| \, \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)} \\ \leq & C_2 N_{2,\omega} e^{\omega(t-s)} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

If $t - s < 1$ estimate (5.8) (with the constant $C_2 N_{2,\omega}$ possibly replaced by a larger one) is a direct consequence of (1.5). Then, $\omega \in \mathfrak{A}_2$ and the set equality $\mathfrak{A}_2 = \mathfrak{B}_2$ follows. ☐

An important consequence of Theorem 5.3 is an estimate for the exponential decay rate of $G(t,s)f$ to $m_s(f)$.

Corollary 5.4. *For every $p > 1$ there exists $C_p > 0$ such that*

$$\|G(t,s)f - m_s(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)} \leq C_p e^{r_0(t-s)} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}, \quad t > s \in I, \ f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu_s).$$

Proof. It is sufficient to apply Proposition 2.6 and Theorem 5.3. ☐

Remark 5.5. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 5.3 it is possible also to prove that $\mathfrak{A}_p = \mathfrak{C}_p$ for any $p \in (1, +\infty)$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{C}_p = \big\{ \omega \in \mathbb{R} : \| \, |\nabla_x G(t,s)f| \, \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)} \leq \Theta_{p,\omega} e^{\omega(t-s)} \|f\|_{W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}, \\ \text{for any } s, t \in I, \ t > s, \ \ f \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu_s) \text{ and some } \Theta_{p,\omega} > 0 \big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.6. For $p = 1$ the sets $\mathfrak{A}_1$ and $\mathfrak{B}_1$ may not coincide, even in the autonomous case. For instance, in the case of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator $(\mathcal{A}\zeta)(x) := \zeta''(x) - x\zeta'(x)$ we have $\mu_t(dx) = (2\pi)^{-1/2} e^{-x^2/2} dx$ for every t, and every $\lambda < 0$ is an eigenvalue of the realization of $\mathcal{A}$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}, \mu)$ as shown in [17]. This implies that $\mathfrak{A}_1$ cannot contain negative numbers, so that $\mathfrak{A}_1 = [0, +\infty)$. On the other hand, in this case $r_0 = -1 \in \mathfrak{B}_1$ by Proposition 2.6.

6. THE CASE OF CONVERGENT COEFFICIENTS AS $t \to +\infty$

Besides Hypotheses 2.1, we assume here the following additional conditions.

Hypotheses 6.1. (i) *For any $r > 0$ and some (and hence any) $t_0 \in I$,*

$$\sup_{(t,x) \in (t_0,+\infty) \times B(0,r)} |b(t,x)| < +\infty;$$

(ii) *there exists a matrix $Q \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that*

$$\lim_{t \to +\infty} Q(t) = Q,$$

in $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d)$;

(iii) *there exist functions* $b_j \in C^{\alpha}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ $(j = 1, \ldots, d)$ *such that*

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} b_j(t,x) = b_j(x), \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,\ j = 1, \ldots, d.$$

Let us consider the elliptic operator $\mathcal{A}$ defined on smooth functions ζ by

$$\mathcal{A}\zeta(x) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} q_{ij} D_{ij}\zeta(x) + \sum_{j=1}^{d} b_j(x) D_j\zeta(x), \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

Due to Hypotheses 2.1(ii)-(iii), the operator $\mathcal{A}$ is uniformly elliptic. Moreover,

$$(\mathcal{A}\varphi)(x) \le a - c\varphi(x), \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{6.1}$$

It is well known that, under Hypotheses 6.1, there exists a Markov semigroup $T(t)$ associated to the operator $\mathcal{A}$ in $C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (see [18, Sect. 4]). For any $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ $u = T(\cdot)f$ is the unique solution to the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} D_t u(t,x) = \mathcal{A}u(t,x), & (t,x) \in (0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d,\\ u(0,x) = f(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases}$$

which belongs to $C_b([0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C^{1,2}((0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover, for any $t > 0$, $T(t)$ is a contraction in $C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Condition (6.1) and the Khas'minskii theorem yield the existence of a unique invariant measure of the semigroup $T(t)$, i.e., a probability measure μ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} T(t)f\,\mu(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\,\mu(dx),$$

for any $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (see [18, Sect. 6]).

Theorem 6.2. *For any* $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu_t(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu(dx),$$

i.e., μ_t *weakly** *converges to* μ *as* $t \to +\infty$.

Proof. Since the evolution system of measures $\{\mu_t : t \in I\}$ is tight, it admits weak* limits as $t \to +\infty$. We will prove that μ is its only weak* limit. For this purpose, let (s_n) and ν_0 be, respectively, a sequence diverging to $+\infty$ and a probability measure such that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu_{s_n}(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\,\nu_0(dx), \qquad f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{6.2}$$

We split the proof into four steps.

Step 1. Here, we prove that, for any $f \in C^{\infty}_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the sequence $(G(\cdot + s_n, s_n)f)$ converges to $T(\cdot)f$ as $n \to +\infty$, locally uniformly in $[0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d$. To this aim, we observe that the function $v_n = G(\cdot + s_n, s_n)f$ belongs to $C_b([0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C^{1,2}([0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ and solves the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} D_t v_n(t,x) = \mathcal{A}(t+s_n)v_n(t,x), & (t,x) \in [0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d,\\ v_n(0,x) = f(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases}$$

Due to Hypotheses 6.1 and to the classical Schauder estimates, for any $r, T > 0$, there exists a positive constant C (which is independent of n) such that

$$\|v_n\|_{C^{1+\alpha/2,2+\alpha}([0,T]\times B(0,r))} \le C\|f\|_{C^{2+\alpha}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Arzelà-Ascoli theorem and a diagonal argument show that there exist a function $u \in C_b([0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C^{1+\alpha/2,2+\alpha}_{\rm loc}([0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ and a subsequence $(s_{n_k}) \subset (s_n)$ such that $v_{n_k} \to u$ in $C^{1,2}([0,T]\times B(0,r))$ for any $T, r > 0$, and $D_t u = \mathcal{A}u$ in $[0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d$. Moreover, $u(0,\cdot) = f$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ since $u_n(0,\cdot) = f$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, $u = T(\cdot)f$. Actually, all the sequence $(G(\cdot + s_n, s_n)f)$ converges locally uniformly in $[0,+\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ to $T(\cdot)f$. Indeed, the previous argument shows that any subsequence $(s'_n) \subset (s_n)$ admits a subsequence (s'_{n_k}) such that $G(\cdot + s'_{n_k}, s'_{n_k})$ converges to $T(\cdot)f$ in $C^{1,2}([0,T] \times B(0,r))$ for any $r, T > 0$, and this is enough to infer that the sequence $(G(\cdot + s_n, s_n))$ converges to $T(\cdot)f$ locally uniformly in $[0,+\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Step 2. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the system of measures $\{\mu_{k+s_n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is tight. Hence, by the Prokhorov theorem, there exist a subsequence (s_n^k) of (s_n) and a probability measure ν_k such that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu_{k+s_n^k}(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\nu_k(dx), \qquad f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Using again a diagonal argument, we can extract a subsequence (t_n) of (s_n) such that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu_{k+t_n}(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\nu_k(dx), \qquad f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{6.3}$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Since $\{\mu_t : t \in I\}$ is tight, the set of measures $\{\nu_k : k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\}$ is tight too. Indeed, fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $R_0 > 0$ be such that $\mu_t(B(0,R_0)) \geq 1-\varepsilon$ for any $t \in I$. Let $\psi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy $\chi_{B(0,R_0)} \leq \psi \leq \chi_{B(0,R_0+1)}$. Then,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi\mu_{k+s_n}(dx) \geq \int_{B(0,R_0)} \mathbb{1}\mu_{k+s_n}(dx) = \mu_{k+s_n}(B(0,R_0)) \geq 1-\varepsilon,$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Letting $n \to +\infty$ gives

$$1-\varepsilon \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi\nu_k(dx) \leq \int_{B(0,R_0+1)} \mathbb{1}\nu_k(dx)$$

and we thus conclude that $\nu_k(B(0,R_0+1)) \geq 1-\varepsilon$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, showing that the set $\{\nu_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is tight.

Step 3. Here, we prove that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} T(k)f\nu_k(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\nu_0(dx), \tag{6.4}$$

for any $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Using (1.4) and (6.2) we get

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(k+t_n,t_n)f\mu_{k+t_n}(dx) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu_{t_n}(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\nu_0(dx), \tag{6.5}$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We claim that the left-hand side of (6.5) equals $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} T(k)f\nu_k(dx)$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(k+t_n,t_n)f\mu_{k+t_n}(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} T(k)f\nu_k(dx)\\
=&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(G(k+t_n,t_n)f - T(k)f\right)\mu_{k+t_n}(dx)\\
&+\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} T(k)f\mu_{k+t_n}(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} T(k)f\nu_k(dx)\right)\\
=:&I_{1,n} + I_{2,n}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (6.3) $I_{2,n}$ tends to 0 as $n \to +\infty$. To prove that also $I_{1,n}$ vanishes as $n \to +\infty$, we fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $R > 0$ such that $\mu_t(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(0,R)) \leq \varepsilon$ for any $t \in I$. Then, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_{1,n}| \leq &\int_{B(0,R)} |G(k+t_n,t_n)f - T(k)f|\mu_{k+t_n}(dx)\\
&+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d\setminus B(0,R)} |G(k+t_n,t_n)f - T(k)f|\mu_{k+t_n}(dx)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \|G(k+t_n,t_n)f - T(k)f\|_{L^\infty(B(0,R))} + 2\|f\|_\infty\varepsilon,$$

since both $G(k+t_n,t_n)f$ and $T(k)f$ are contractions in $C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$. By Step 1

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty}|I_{1,n}| \leq \varepsilon$$

and, since $\varepsilon>0$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $I_{1,n}$ tends to 0 as $n\to+\infty$. Formula (6.4) follows.

Step 4. Here, using formula (6.4) we conclude the proof. We remark that estimate (2.9), with $p=1$, and Step 1 imply $\|\,|\nabla_x T(t)f|\,\|_\infty \leq e^{-r_0 t}\|\,|\nabla f|\,\|_\infty$ for every $t>0$. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 2.7 we obtain that $T(k)f$ converges to $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu(dx)$ locally uniformly in $\mathbb{R}^d$, for any $f\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Now, using the same argument of Step 3, we show that

$$\lim_{k\to+\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} T(k)f\nu_k(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu(dx). \tag{6.6}$$

Since $\{\nu_k : k\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is a tight system of probability measures, for any $\varepsilon>0$ there exists $R>0$ such that $\nu_k(\mathbb{R}^d\setminus B(0,R))\leq\varepsilon$ for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} T(k)f\nu_k(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu(dx)\right| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left|T(k)f - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu(dx)\right|\nu_k(dx)\\ &\leq \int_{B(0,R)}\left|T(k)f - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu(dx)\right|\nu_k(dx)\\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\setminus B(0,R)}\left|T(k)f - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu(dx)\right|\nu_k(dx)\\ &\leq \left\|T(k)f - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu(dx)\right\|_{L^\infty(B(0,R))} + 2\|f\|_\infty\varepsilon,\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\limsup_{k\to+\infty}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} T(k)f\nu_k(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu(dx)\right| \leq \varepsilon$$

and (6.6) follows.

Formulae (6.4) and (6.6) yield

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\nu_0(dx), \qquad f\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

This shows that $\nu_0=\mu$ and completes the proof. ☐

Remark 6.3. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 6.2, we can prove that, if $\omega\in\mathfrak{A}_p$, then there exists $M>0$ such that

$$\left\|T(t)f - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu(dx)\right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)} \leq Me^{\omega t}\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)}, \qquad f\in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu).$$

Remark 6.4. In the case of T-time periodic coefficients considered in [14], the tight evolution system of measures $\{\mu_t : t\in I\}$ is T-periodic, namely $\mu_{t+T}=\mu_t$ for any $t\in\mathbb{R}$, and $\{\mu_t : t\in I\}$ coincides with the set of its weak* limit measures. Indeed, if a sequence μ_{t_n} weakly* converges to μ as $t_n\to+\infty$, then setting $s_n = t_n - [t_n/T]T\in[0,T)$ (where $[\,\cdot\,]$ denotes the integer part) a subsequence (s_{n_k}) of (s_n) converges to some $s_0\in[0,T]$. Since the function $s\mapsto\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu_s(dx)$ is continuous in $\mathbb{R}$ for every $f\in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu_{t_{n_k}}(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu_{s_{n_k}}(dx) \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\mu_{s_0}(dx),$$

as $k\to+\infty$, for every $f\in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Hence, $\mu=\mu_{s_0}$. Conversely, since each measure μ_t is the weak* limit of the sequence of measure (μ_{t+nT}), the claim follows.

7. Comments and examples

The key tool of our analysis is estimate (2.9), and of course the existence of a tight evolution system of measures for $G(t,s)$. With the noteworthy exception of time depending Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operators (see Subsection 6.1), Hypotheses 2.1(iii) and 2.1(iv) are quite natural conditions that guarantee the validity of estimate (2.9) and the existence of a tight evolution system of measures, respectively.

Still assuming that Hypotheses 2.1(i)-(iii) hold, we could avoid Hypotheses 2.1(iv), replacing it by its consequences

$$\begin{aligned}&\exists\kappa<0:\ |(\nabla_x G(t,s)f)(x)|\le e^{\kappa(t-s)}(G(t,s)|\nabla f|)(x), && I\ni s<t,\ x\in\mathbb{R}^d,\\ &\|\,|\nabla_x G(t,s)f|\,\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)}\le c_p(t-s)^{-1/2}\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}, && s<t\le s+1,\end{aligned}$$

plus some control on $\langle b(t,x),x\rangle$, such as $\langle b(t,x),x\rangle\le C_{a,b}(1+|x|^2)\varphi(x)$ for $a\le t\le b$, $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$, to estimate the integrals

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}G(t,s)f^p\log(G(t,s)f^p)\mathcal{A}(t)\theta_n\,\mu_t(dx),\qquad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}G(t,s)f^p\mathcal{A}(t)\theta_n\,\mu_t(dx),$$

that arise in the proof of Theorems 3.3 and 4.1.

7.1. **Nonautonomous Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operators.**

Time depending Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operators,

$$(\mathcal{L}(t)\zeta)(x)=\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}(B(t)B^*(t)D^2\zeta(x))+\langle A(t)x+g(t),\nabla\zeta(x)\rangle,\qquad t\in\mathbb{R},\ x\in\mathbb{R}^d, \tag{7.1}$$

have been studied in [8, 9]. In fact, in these papers backward Cauchy problems were considered and the evolution operator was backward, however all the statements may be easily rewritten as statements for forward evolution equations and evolution operators.

The assumptions are the following: $B,A:\mathbb{R}\to\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}^d$ are continuous and bounded, $Q(t):=B(t)(B(t))^*/2$ satisfies the uniform ellipticity condition (1.3), and the norm of the evolution operator $U(t,s)$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ associated to the equation $u'(t)=-A(t)u(t)$ decays exponentially as $t-s\to-\infty$. More precisely, for any $s\in\mathbb{R}$, $U(\cdot,s)$ is the unique solution to the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases}D_tU(t,s)=-A(t)U(t,s), & t\in\mathbb{R},\\ U(s,s)=I,\end{cases}$$

where I denotes the identity matrix, and the decay estimate is

$$\omega_0(U)=\inf\{\omega\in\mathbb{R}:\exists M_\omega\ge 1 \text{ such that } \|U(t,s)\|\le M_\omega e^{\omega(s-t)},\ t\le s\}<0. \tag{7.2}$$

Then, it is possible to write down explicitly both $G(t,s)$ and all the systems of evolution measures for $G(t,s)$. Among them, the unique tight system of evolution measures consists of Gaussian measures μ_t given by

$$\mu_t(dx)=(2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}}(\det Q_t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\,e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle Q_t^{-1}(x-g_t),x-g_t\rangle}dx,\qquad t\in\mathbb{R}, \tag{7.3}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}Q_t&=\int_t^{+\infty}U(t,\xi)B(\xi)B^*(\xi)U^*(t,\xi)d\xi, && t\in\mathbb{R},\\ g_t&=\int_t^{+\infty}U(t,\xi)g(\xi)d\xi, && t\in\mathbb{R}.\end{aligned}$$

So, in this case Hypothesis 2.1(iii) is not needed, since the tight evolution system of measures is explicit. Assumption (7.2) is not equivalent to our Hypothesis 2.1(iv).

For instance, taking $d = 2$, $A(t) = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 2 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$, we get easily $\omega_0(U) = -1$, but (2.3) is not satisfied by any $r_0 < 0$.

However, the proof of Theorem 5.3 relies on the hypercontractivity estimates, on the Poincaré inequality for $p = 2$, that holds for the above Gaussian measures with constants independent of t, and on the gradient estimates (2.9) and (2.10).

Hypercontractivity and estimates (2.9), (2.10) were proved in [9, Thm. 3.3], [8, Lemma 3.3]. Thus, we can apply Theorem 5.3 and conclude that $\mathfrak{A}_p = \mathfrak{B}_p$ for any $p > 1$. Again [8, Lemma 3.3] shows that $\mathfrak{B}_p \supset (\omega_0(U), +\infty)$ so that

$$\|G(t,s)f - m_s(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_t)} \le M_{p,\omega} e^{\omega(t-s)} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu_s)}, \qquad t > s, \tag{7.4}$$

for every $\omega \in (\omega_0(U), 0)$, $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu_s)$, $p > 1$ and some positive constant $M_{p,\omega}$. Estimate (7.4) improves the decay estimate obtained for $p = 2$ in [9, Thm. 2.17], and it answers positively to the conjecture raised in [9].

7.2. **More general nonautonomous operators.** Here we exhibit some classes of nonautonomous elliptic operators that satisfy Hypothesis 2.1(iii), since the other ones are easy to be checked.

Let $(\mathcal{A}(t))_{t\in I}$ be defined by (1.2), and assume that its coefficients q_{ij} and b_i satisfy the regularity and ellipticity assumptions of Hypotheses 2.1(i)-(ii), and the dissipativity condition in Hypothesis 2.1(iv). Moreover, we assume that there exist three positive constants K_1, R, $\beta > 1$ such that

$$\langle b(t,x), x\rangle \le -K_1|x|^\beta, \qquad t \in I,\ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(0,R), \tag{7.5}$$

Then the function

$$\varphi(x) = e^{\delta|x|^\beta}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

satisfies Hypothesis 2.1(iii). Indeed, for $t \in I$ and $|x| \ge R$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{A}(t)\varphi)(x) =& \delta\beta\varphi(x)\big[(\delta\beta|x|^{2\beta-4} + (\beta-2)|x|^{\beta-4})\langle Q(t)x, x\rangle \\ &+ \mathrm{Tr}(Q(t))|x|^{\beta-2} + \langle b(t,x), x\rangle |x|^{\beta-2}\big] \\ \le& \delta\beta\varphi(x)[\delta\beta\Lambda|x|^{2\beta-2} + \Lambda(d+\beta-2)|x|^{\beta-2} - K_1|x|^{2\beta-2})] \\ =:& g_1(x)\varphi(x).\end{aligned}$$

If δ is small enough (i.e., $\delta < K_1/(\beta\Lambda)$), then $\lim_{|x|\to+\infty} g_1(x) = -\infty$. Then there exist a, $c > 0$ such that $\mathcal{A}(t)\varphi \le a - c\varphi$ for $t \in I$.

If (7.5) is replaced by

$$\exists \overline{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \sup_{t\in I} |b(t,\overline{y})| =: K_2 < +\infty, \tag{7.6}$$

then for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ the function

$$\varphi(x) = e^{\delta|x-\overline{y}|^2}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

satisfies Hypothesis 2.1(iii). Indeed, taking into account that by (2.4) we have $\langle b(t,x), x - \overline{y}\rangle \le r_0|x-\overline{y}|^2 + K_2|x-\overline{y}|$ for $t \in I$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{A}(t)\varphi)(x) =& (4\delta^2\langle Q(t)(x-\overline{y}), (x-\overline{y})\rangle + 2\delta\mathrm{Tr}(Q(t)) + 2\delta\langle b(t,x), x-\overline{y}\rangle)\varphi(x) \\ \le& (4\delta^2\Lambda|x-\overline{y}|^2 + 2\delta d\Lambda + 2\delta(r_0|x-\overline{y}|^2 + K_2|x-\overline{y}|))\varphi(x) \\ =:& g_2(x)\varphi(x).\end{aligned}$$

If δ is small enough ($\delta < |r_0|/2\Lambda$), then $\lim_{|x|\to+\infty} g_2(x) = -\infty$. Then, there exist two positive constants a, c such that $\mathcal{A}(t)\varphi \le a - c\varphi$ for $t \in I$.

Note that condition (7.6) is satisfied for every $\overline{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in the case of time periodic coefficients considered in [14].

REFERENCES

[1] V.I. Bogachev, N.V. Krylov, M. Röckner, *On regularity of transition probabilities and invariant measures of singular diffusion under minimal conditions*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **26** (2001), 2037-2080.

[2] S. Cerrai, Second order PDE's in finite and infinite dimensions. A probabilistic approach, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1762**, Springer-Verlag, 2001.

[3] G. Da Prato, M. Röckner, *A note on evolution systems of measures for time-dependent stochastic differential equations*, Proceedings of the 5th Seminar on Stochastic Analysis, Random Fields and Applications, Ascona 2005, Progr. Probab. **59**, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2008, 115-122.

[4] G. Da Prato, J. Zabczyk, Ergodicity for infinite-dimensional systems, London Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser., Cambridge Univ. Press.

[5] E.B. Davies, Heat kernes and spectral theory. Cambridge tracts in Mathematics **92**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1990.

[6] J.D. Deuschel, D. Stroock, Large Deviations, Academic Press, San Diego, 1984.

[7] L.C. Evans, Partial differential equations. Graduate Studies in Matemathics **19**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence (RI), 1998.

[8] M. Geissert, A. Lunardi, *Invariant measures and maximal L^2 regularity for nonautonomous Ornstein-Uhlenbeck equations*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **77** (2008), 719-740.

[9] M. Geissert, A. Lunardi, *Asymptotic behavior and hypercontractivity in nonautonomous Ornstein-Uhlenbeck equations*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **79** (2009), 85-106.

[10] I.I. Gikhman, A.V. Skorohod, Stochastic differential equations. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1972.

[11] L. Gross, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities*, Amer. J. Math. **97** (1975), 1061-1083.

[12] M. Kunze, L. Lorenzi, A. Lunardi, *Nonautonomous Kolmogorov parabolic equations with unbounded coefficients*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **362** (2010), 169-198.

[13] O.A. Ladyžhenskaja, V.A. Solonnikov, N.N. Ural'ceva *Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type* American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I. 1968.

[14] L. Lorenzi, A. Lunardi, A. Zamboni, *Asymptotic behavior in time periodic parabolic problems with unbounded coefficients*, J. Differential Equations **249** (2010), 3377-3418.

[15] L. Lorenzi, A. Zamboni, *Cores for parabolic operators with unbounded coefficients*, J. Differential Equations **246** (2009), 2724-2761.

[16] A. Lunardi, G. Metafune, D. Pallara, *Dirichlet boundary conditions for elliptic operators with unbounded drift*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **133** (2005), 2625-2635.

[17] G. Metafune, D. Pallara, E. Priola, *Spectrum of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operators in L^p spaces with respect to invariant measures*, J. Funct. Anal. **196** (2002), 40-60.

[18] G. Metafune, D. Pallara, M. Wacker, *Feller semigroups on $\mathbb{R}^N$*, Semigroup Forum, **65** (2002), 159-205.

[19] J. Prüss, A. Rhandi, R. Schnaubelt, *The domain of elliptic operators on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with unbounded drift coefficients*, Houston J. Math. **32** (2006), 563-576.

[20] O. S. Rothaus, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities and the spectrum of Schrödinger operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **42** (1981), 110-120.

[21] F.-Y. Wang, *A character of the gradient estimate for diffusion semigroups*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **133** (2004), 827-834.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI PARMA, PARCO AREA DELLE SCIENZE 53/A, I-43124 PARMA, ITALY.

E-mail address: `(luciana.angiuli, luca.lorenzi, alessandra.lunardi)@unipr.it`